



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/748,843

12/27/2000

Taira Hanaoka

14196

6311

23389

7590

09/02/2009

SCULLY SCOTT MURPHY & PRESSER, PC

400 GARDEN CITY PLAZA

SUITE 300

GARDEN CITY, NY 11530

EXAMINER

CARLSON, JEFFREY D

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3622

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

09/02/2009

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 09/748,843	<b>Applicant(s)</b> HANAOKA ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Jeffrey D. Carlson	<b>Art Unit</b> 3622	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 June 2009.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 3-16 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 3-16 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)          | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

## DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to the paper(s) filed 6/2/2009.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. **Claims 1, 3-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schena et al (418) (US6546418) in view of either of JP200047789A or Bates et al (US6184886).**

Regarding claims 1, 3, 6, Schena et al (418) teaches methods and apparatus for scanning printed codes (such as barcode images) which are processed by an extraction element which decodes an associated URL that is used to retrieve advertising information over a network and display it to the user on the apparatus [abstract, 6:19-21]. Schena et al does not teach displaying the scanned image on the apparatus. Schena et al *does* however teach that the user device scans the codes for immediate or delayed processing or for reference and that *the links may be collected, sorted and prioritized locally by the user's device* [10:7-12, 43-47]. Schena et al teaches that the device generates and stores a code file in memory representing a collection of codes scanned and that for example, a user may scan several codes in a magazine or at a store, save them and then later process them [7:61 to 8:5, 12:56-61, 17:40-42]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time of the invention to have stored the

history of scanned links as recallable bookmarks so that a user could recall the collection of collected, sorted and locally stored links for future reference, in a manner as is well known with bookmarking websites. This would enable the user to manage and selectively recall previously-stored codes. Both JP200047789A and Bates et al teach URL bookmarking concepts whereby a thumbnail image is associated with a bookmarked URL. This thumbnail image is a pictorial representation of the content that is bookmarked. [Bates et al @ 6:3-8; JP200047789A @ English translation]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time of the invention to have stored and displayed the actual scanned image on the display as a visual thumbnail (i.e. as a bookmark's icon) so that Schena et al's suggested collection of collected, sorted and locally stored links can be visually associated with their source printed page (whether an image, text, an article, etc.) and can be selected/launched in order to visit and/or re-visit web content associated with that scanned image of the printed page portion. This thumbnail or visual representation would help guide the user in identifying what each bookmark stands for, in a similar manner as JP200047789A or Bates et al's and enables the user to visually distinguish one bookmark from another while displayed on the screen. One of ordinary skill would recognize the need to keep the plurality of bookmarks distinguishable from one another and by providing a visually identifiable thumbnail image of the scanned source would provide a predictable way to offer that ability to visually distinguish between saved bookmarks. Regarding applicant's added claim language directed to a single, handheld device, Schena et al teaches that the receiver may be provided in various forms, including a cell phone, remote control, a

personal digital assistant (i.e. a PDA), a pager etc., (each of these are taken by the examiner to be portable, handheld devices) [4:1-8], that the scanner may be a “handheld device” such as a cell phone, remote control, PDA, palmtop, pager, etc., (each of these are taken by the examiner to be portable, handheld devices) and that the scanner and receiver may be integrated into a single device [6:2-3, FIG 3]. This is taken to be a teaching for a single, integrated, handheld device.

4. Regarding claims 4, 5, 7, Schena et al (418) teaches the use of a network url to display advertising on a web page [9:1-5]. The printed publication that includes the coding is taken to provide an article. The displayed content may be video [2:30-56].

5. Regarding claims 8-11, 13, 14, Schena et al (418) teaches that displayed ads are tracked for billing purposes. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time of the invention to have provided an accounting server with charge table (database) to keep track of the billing. Schena et al (418) teaches that the billing may be based on the advertising selected and the number of impressions (access number). Official Notice is taken that it is well known to charge for advertising based on other functions such as time of day, the referring article content and the type of ad. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time of the invention to have based advertising billing on any of these methods in order to charge the advertiser for the provided ads. Further, Schena et al (418) teaches sharing revenue/fees among all involved parties including bandwidth carrier (ISP provider), advertiser, content provider, etc. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time of the invention to have charged the publisher for any portion of any required ISP connection charges so

as to reduce/eliminate ISP connections charged for the user – a practice which is well known.

6. Regarding claim 12, Schena et al (418) teaches that the advertising/content displayed may be tailored to the user according to the user's location [7:15-20].

7. Regarding claims 15, 16, bookmarks are well known to include a title as well as a URL. Further, Both JP200047789A and Bates et al include titles with the bookmarks. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time of the invention to have included titles with the suggested bookmarks for Schena et al so that a user may also rely on each title to help identify and distinguish among bookmarks.

### **Response to Argument**

8. Applicant's arguments have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. Both JP200047789A and Bates et al teach visual indicators/thumbnails for bookmarks. One of ordinary skill would recognize the benefits of such visual indicators for visually distinguishing among bookmarks and associating bookmarks with their source content appearance.

### **Conclusion**

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jeffrey D. Carlson whose telephone number is 571-272-6716. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Fridays; off alternate Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Eric Stamber can be reached on (571)272-6724. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Jeffrey D. Carlson/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3622

Jeffrey D. Carlson  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 3622